

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, and 4-14 are pending in this Application.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 8 are currently amended. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-14 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, and 4-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0059095 (hereinafter “Cook”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,067,525 (hereinafter “Johnson”).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1, 2, and 4-14 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Cook and Johnson. Applicants respectfully submit that Cook and Johnson, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1, 2, and 4-14. These differences, along with other differences, establish that the subject matter as a whole of claims 1, 2, and 4-14 would not have been obvious at the time of invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

For example, amended claim 1 recites the limitation of “generating, with one or more processors associated with the one or more computer systems hosting the network-based sales territory planning and targeting tool, information based on the customers’ needs and install base information tagging as sales opportunities those products and/or services offered for sale by the salesperson that match the customers’ needs and those products and/or services of the customers’ install base of products and/or services offered by the salesperson that the customers are likely to consider purchasing” and “generating, with the one or more processors associated with the one or more computer systems hosting the network-based sales territory planning and targeting tool, information based on the customers’ needs and the install base information tagging areas where the salesperson should gather additional install base information as

unknown.” These limitations are supported in the Application, for example, at least in FIG. 1 where the Application illustrates entries displaying products and/or services offered for sale by the salesperson that match a customers’ needs and those products and/or services of the customers’ install base of products and/or services offered by the salesperson that the customers are likely to consider purchasing as “Opportunities.” Additionally, entries are displayed for products and/or services offered for sale by the salesperson for areas where the salesperson should gather additional install base information as “Unknown.” As discussed in paragraph [0024], whitespaces can be identified that correspond to unmet needs as well as identifying a customer’s own install base of products or services. These whitespaces can then search used as a basis for searching and the results presented in a way that a sales representative may view existing and potential opportunities.

Cook and Johnson, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose one or suggest that whitespaces in a customer’s need information and in the customer’s install base information are automatically tagged as sales opportunities or as areas where the salesperson should gather additional install base information as recited in amended claim 1. Specifically, in rejecting claim 1, the Office Action merely alleges that Cook discloses in paragraph [0006] matching a customer’s need requirements to products or services that a company provides. However, the Office Action does show that Cook expressly or impliedly discloses or suggests generating information tagging as sales opportunities those products and/or services offered for sale by the salesperson that match the customers’ needs and those products and/or services of the customers’ install base of products and/or services offered by the salesperson that the customers are likely to consider purchasing in the same way as recited in amended claim 1 as part of the alleged matching process. Additionally, the Office Action acknowledges that Cook does not disclose or suggest the install base information as recited in claim 1 and merely relies on Johnson for presenting company product information side-by-side with a competitor’s product information. The Office Action fails to present a convincing line of reasoning as to why a skilled artisan would have modified Cook to also tag as sales opportunities those products and/or services of the customers’ install base of products and/or services offered by the salesperson that the customers are likely to consider purchasing in the same way as recited in amended claim 1

Furthermore, Cook and Johnson, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose one or suggest tagging areas where the salesperson should gather additional install base information as unknown. As depicted in FIG. 1, entries are tagged as “Unknown” for areas where the salesperson should gather additional install base information. In contrast, Cook and Johnson fail to disclose the tagging as recited in amended claim 1.

Finally, Cook and Johnson, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose one or suggest receiving a search formulated via the recited first user interface specifying a first parameter requesting the products and/or services offered for sale by the salesperson tagged as sales opportunities and a second parameter requesting areas where the salesperson should gather additional install base information tagged as unknown. As depicted in FIG. 4, a search may be formulated via a user interface to request “Opportunities” and “Unknown” information related to customers. Accordingly, as discussed in paragraph [0024], a sales representative can search and view these whitespaces for existing (e.g., tagged sales opportunities) and potential opportunities (e.g., tagged as unknown).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Cook and Johnson fail to disclose each and every claim limitation as recited in amended claim 1. Applicants further respectfully submit that none of the cited references cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Cook and Johnson, and thus, amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 8 is allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims that depend directly and/or indirectly from independent claims 1 and 8 are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application.

Appl. No. 10/755,162
Amdt. dated August 2, 2010
Reply to Office Action of March 31, 2010

PATENT

Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

Further, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment in connection with this paper to Deposit Account No. 20-1430.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lls
62562048 v1